UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,579	05/03/2002	Dan L. Eaton	P3230R1C001-168	2391

30313 7590 06/03/2004

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER	
KAPUST, RACHEL B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/063,579	EATON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachel B. Kapust	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 September 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 May 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

According to the priority statement of September 9, 2002, the claimed subject matter defined in the instant application is supported by parent application serial nos. 10/006867, PCT/US00/23328, 09/380137, PCT/US99/12252, and 60/089514. Based on the information given by applicant and an inspection of the patent applications, the examiner has concluded that the subject matter defined in this application is not supported by the disclosures of 09/380137, PCT/US99/12252, and 60/089514 because the priority documents are not enabling for the claimed polypeptide, PRO 1124. The current application is a continuation of 10/006867 which is a continuation of PCT/US00/23328 filed August 24, 2000, all of which have the same specification and disclose the same subject matter. Accordingly, the subject matter defined in claims 1-13 has an effective filing date of August 24, 2000.

Should the Applicant disagree with the examiner's factual determination above, it is incumbent upon the applicant to provide the serial number and specific page number(s) of any parent application filed prior to August 24, 2000 that specifically supports the particular claim limitation for each and every claim limitation in all the pending claims which applicant considers to have been in possession of and fully enabled prior to August 24, 2000.

Specification

The use of the trademarks KLENTAQ™ (p. 117), QIAQUICK™ (p. 119), SUPERFECT™ (p. 129), FUGENE™ (p. 129), and BACULOGOLD™ (p. 131) have been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility. Claims 1-13 are directed to polypeptides comprising SEQ ID NO: 70. The claimed polypeptides are not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility.

A specific and substantial utility is one that is particular to the subject matter claimed and that identifies a "real world" use for the claimed invention. See *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (1966):

> The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility. . . . [u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field.

Uses such as assaying for binding partners (p. 89), using polypeptides as molecular weight markers (p. 92), and screening for agonists and antagonists of PRO 1124 (p. 95) are useful only in research to determine the function of the encoded protein itself. There is no "specific benefit in currently available form" to be derived from such studies. Applicants teach that the PRO 1124 polypeptide or agonists or antagonists of PRO 1124 may be used in the preparation of medicaments, however the specification does not disclose any diseases or conditions known to be associated with the encoded protein. Further research would be required to identify a disease in which the encoded protein is involved. See *Brenner v. Manson*, noting that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." A patent is therefore not a license to experiment. Further research would be required to determine how and if PRO 1124 is involved in any disease.

The invention also lacks a well-established utility. A well-established utility is a specific, substantial, and credible utility that is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material. The specification fails to assert any

activity for the polypeptide. Applicants have not asserted that PRO 1124 is a member of any protein family nor have Applicants asserted that PRO 1124 is homologous to any known proteins. Although PRO 1124 is homologous to a calcium-dependent chloride channel (see U.S. Patent 6,368,792 SEQ ID NOS: 16, 18, and 41), identifying a polypeptide as a member of the calcium-dependent chloride channel family does not endow the polypeptide with a well-established utility. The '792 patent teaches that the calcium-dependent chloride channel is a marker for gastrointestinal tract diseases. However, this is not a well-established utility because it is neither well known nor readily apparent from Applicant's disclosure of a single sequence. One of skill in the art would not know what the biophysical effects of the calcium-dependent chloride channel would have on the cellular environment. The biophysical and pharmacological characteristics of a calcium-dependent chloride channel family member could not be discerned by simply identifying it as a member of the family. There is no well-established utility for members of this family; utility is specific to the individual protein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation that the encoded protein comprises an "extracellular domain ... lacking its associated signal peptide" (claim 1, part (d), for example) is indefinite as a signal sequence is not generally considered to be part of an extracellular domain, as signal sequences are cleaved from said domains in the process of maturation.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-13 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claims 1-5 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, were it enabled for an isolated polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 70 or least the mature form of SEQ ID NO: 70, would still not reasonably provide enablement for polypeptides having at least 80%, 85%, 90%, 95% or 99% amino acid sequence identity to the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 70. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors considered when determining if the disclosure satisfies the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue include, but are not limited to: 1) nature of the invention, 2) state of the prior art, 3) relative skill of those in the art, 4) level of predictability in the art, 5) existence of working examples, 6) breadth of claims, 7) amount of direction or guidance by the inventor, and 8) quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The claims are drawn to a polypeptide having at least 80%, 85%, 90%, 95% or 99% amino acid sequence identity to the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 70, referred to as PRO1124. There is no functional limitation in the claims. Applicants have taught the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 70, as well as the putative signal sequence. However, there is no function known in the art to be associated with such a polypeptide, nor have Applicants provided any evidence of functions for the polypeptide.

The claims encompass an unreasonable number of inoperative polypeptides, which the skilled artisan would not know how to use. The specification provides no teachings as to the structural or related functional characteristics of this protein. There are no working examples of polypeptides less than 100% identical to the polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 70. The skilled artisan would not know how to use non-identical polypeptides on the basis of teachings in the prior art or specification. The claims are broad because they do not require the claimed polypeptide to be identical to the disclosed sequence and because the claims have no functional limitation.

For these reasons, which include the complexity and unpredictability of the nature of the invention and art in terms of the diversity of transmembrane proteins, and lack of knowledge about function(s) of encompassed polypeptides structurally related to SEQ ID NO: 70, the lack of direction or guidance for using polypeptides that are not identical to at least the mature form of SEQ ID NO: 70, and the breadth of the claims for structure without function, it would require undue experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Claims 1-5 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to polypeptides having at least 80%, 85%, 90%, 95% or 99% sequence identity with a particular disclosed sequence. The claims do not require that the encoded polypeptide possess any particular biological activity, nor any particular conserved structure, or other disclosed distinguishing feature. Thus, the claims are drawn to a genus of polypeptides that is defined only by sequence identity.

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of compete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, the only factor present in the claims is a partial structure in the form of a recitation of percent identity. There is not even

identification of any particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. As stated above, it is not even clear what region of the protein has the disclosed activity. Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed.*" (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated polypeptides comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 70 but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,368,792 (Billing-Medel *et al.*). Claims 1-5 are drawn to polypeptides that are at least 80%, 85%, 90%, 95%, or 99% identical to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 70. Claim 12 is drawn to a chimeric polypeptide comprising a polypeptide at least 80% identical to SEQ ID NO: 70 fused to a heterologous polypeptide. Claim 13 is drawn to a chimeric polypeptide comprising an epitope tag or an Fc region of an immunoglobulin and a protein at leas 80% identical to SEQ ID NO: 70. The '792 patent teaches SEQ ID NO: 18 which encodes a polypeptide 99.4% identical to SEQ ID NO: 70 (see attached aliginments). The '792 patent also teaches SEQ ID NO: 41 which is 99.4% identical to SEQ ID NO: 70. The '792 patent also teaches fusion proteins comprising SEQ ID NO: 41 fused to a heterologous sequence (see column 29, lines 30-34). The '792 patent also teaches fusion proteins comprising SEQ ID NO: 41 fused to an epitope tag (see column 17, lines 44-54). Thus, claims 1-5 and 12-13 are anticipated by the '792 patent.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Agnel et al. (1999, FEBS Letters 455: 295-301). Claims 1-5 are drawn to polypeptides that are least 80%, 85%, 90%, 95%, or 99% identical to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 70. Agnel et al. teach the nucleic acid sequence found in Accession No. AF127035 which is 97.5% identical to SEQ ID NO: 69 and it encodes a polypeptide that is 99.4% identical to SEQ ID NO: 70 (see attached alignments). Thus, claims 1-5 are anticipated by Agnel et al.

Conclusion

NO CLAIMS ARE ALLOWED.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel B. Kapust whose telephone number is (571) 272-0886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on (571) 272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RBK
5/28/04

JANET ANDRES
PATENT EXAMINER